



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,909	01/02/2001	Yoon-Taek Jung	P-163	7303
34610	7590	10/06/2003	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			FARKONDAR TONSEY, FARIMA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2681	7

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/750,909	JUNG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Farima Farkhondar	2681

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 1/2/2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.  
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
     a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "PIC 22" in figure 3, has been used to designate both "AUTHENTICATION AND AUTHORIZATION ON ORIGINATED CALL" block and "COLLECTION OF INFORMATION" block. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 2, line 18, "authentication may fails" is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested to change "fails" to "fail"

Page 5, line 7, "an valid originated call" is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested to change "an" to "a".

Page 12, line 7, "various steps and service are" is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested to change "service" to "services".

Page 17, line 13, "authentication fails of an authorization is denied" is grammatically incorrect. It is suggested to change "of" to "or".

Page 19, line 19, the bee in "authorization has bee denied" has been misspelled. It is suggested to change "bee" to "been".

Page 51, line 7, "and" is misspelled as "nd". It is suggested to change "nd" to "and".

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777.

Regarding claim 1, Pilc discloses a method for processing authentication failed/authorization denied subscribers by an intelligent network, comprising: detecting an authentication failure or authorization denial for a subscriber who has originated a call and informing a service control point (SCP) of the failure or denial (Figure 5, block 811, note detecting the condition that the call requires security is equivalent to detecting the condition that authentication failure or authorization denial has occurred); instructing by the SCP that the call originated by the subscriber be connected to a prescribed location (column 6, lines 30-36, note the prescribed location here is security system 133); and inducing the subscriber to normal service according to the instruction of the SCP (Figs 5-7 induce connection in block 833 of Fig. 7 according to the instruction of SCP).

Regarding claim 3, see the rejection of claim 1 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc discloses the detection is performed by an Origination\_Attempt\_Unauthorized detection point (Fig 5, block 811 see also column 6, lines 32-34, note recognizing that this call may require a security processing beyond a first level is equivalent to detection of authentication failure).

Regarding claim 4, see the rejection of claim 3 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc discloses the Origination\_Attempt\_Unauthorized detection point comprises an authorization failure trigger configured to indicate a state of the authentication failure or the authorization denial (Fig 5, block 815, also column 7, lines 13-15, note the state of “first level met” is equivalent to the state of authentication failure or the authorization denial), and wherein the state determines whether the SCP is informed of the authentication failure or authorization denial when the subscriber who attempted the call was authentication-failed or authorization-denied (Figure 5, blocks 815 and 823, see also column 7, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 5, see the rejection of claim 4 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc discloses the SCP is informed of the authentication failure or authorization denial when the authorization failure trigger is in an activated state (Yes state between blocks 815 and 823 of Fig 5 is equivalent to activated state.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al. in view of D'Amico, US Patent 5579379.

Regarding claim 2, see the rejection of claim 1 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc does not disclose the step of inducing the subscriber to normal service comprises: collecting information on the call for which authentication has failed or authorization has been denied; analyzing the collected information; and selecting a route to set up a call according to the analyzed information. However D'Amico teaches the step of inducing the subscriber to normal service comprises: collecting information on the call for which authentication has failed or authorization has been denied (column 21, 24-29); analyzing the collected information; and selecting a route to set up a call according to the analyzed information (column 21, lines 48-52). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by D'Amico to Pilc, in order to get further information on a call for which authentication has failed or authorization has been denied so a decision can be made on where to route the call to induce the subscriber to normal service.

7. Claims 6, 7, 9, 11, 14,15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777 and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691, and further in view of Hanson, US Patent 6029062.

Regarding claim 6, Pilc discloses a method for processing authorization failed/authorization denied subscribers by an intelligent network (4ESS 128 and 130 in figure 1, shows an intelligent network), comprising: analyzing an authentication and authorization of a subscriber originating a call when the call is detected by a mobile switching system (Fig 1. block 813, note performing first level of security processing is equivalent to analyzing authentication and authorization); determining whether an authorization denial trigger is in a state of activation if the subscriber is authorization-denied (the YES state of block 815 in Fig 5 is equivalent to state of activation); releasing the call (Fig 7, block 817) if the authorization denial trigger is in a non-activated state (No state of block 815 in Fig 5), or transmitting an origination request instruction message including a parameter indicating a reason for the authentication failure or the authorization denial against the subscriber (block 827, Fig. 5, also column 9, lines 25-27), to an SCP if the authorization denial trigger is in an activated state (Yes state of block 815 in Fig 5); Pilc does not disclose the origination request message including a parameter indicating location information of the subscriber. However, Easley teaches, "The registration notification operation is used to report (to the HLR 23 for the MS) the location of the MS (including the VLR and the MSC currently serving the MS)". Additionally, Easley teaches, "The ORREQ Invoke message 51 may include as much

Art Unit: 2681

information as is known at the current state of the call so that the service logic within the SCP 22 may use that information" (column 13, line lines 2-5). Hence, the information can include the location of the mobile, which became available during registration. Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Easley to Pilc, in order to provide location information. Furthermore, Pilc does not disclose transmitting a voice announcement provided by a switching system before releasing the call when the authorization denial is in non-activated state. Additionally, Pilc does not disclose transmitting a response message to the switching system to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location according to an analysis of the origination request instructing message; and connecting the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location according to the response message. However Hanson discloses transmitting a voice announcement provided by a switching system before releasing the call when the authorization denial is in a non-activated state (column 6, lines 24-28). Hanson further discloses transmitting a response message to the switching system to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location according to an analysis of the origination request instructing message; and connecting the call originated by the subscriber to prescribed location according to the response message (column 6 line 67 to column 7, line 7). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Hansen to Pilc, in order to provide additional options to reroute the call of an authorization failed/authorization denied subscriber to a billing center or Intelligent

Peripheral voice announcements or play an announcement and release the call if the authentication has failed due to fraudulent activity.

Regarding claim 7, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Hansen do not disclose the origination request instruction message comprises an OriginationRequest INVOKE message in an intelligent network of a North American wireless standard. However, Easley discloses origination request instruction message comprises an OriginationRequest INVOKE message in an intelligent network of a North American wireless standard (column 12 lines 61 to column 13, line 5). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught Easley to Pilc and Hansen, in order to conform to North American wireless standards.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Hansen do not disclose the response message comprises an OriginationRequest RETURN RESULT message to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location in an intelligent network of a North American wireless standard. However Easley discloses the response message comprises an OriginationRequest RETURN RESULT message to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location in an intelligent network of a North American wireless standard (column 16, lines 55-67). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the

above feature as taught Easley to Pilc and Hansen, in order to conform to North American wireless standards.

Regarding claim 11, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Hansen do not disclose when the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises one of (A) a routing number to route to an operator of a service center that handles authentication failure or authorization denial and (B) information corresponding to a phone number assigned by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal, then the switching system connects the originated call with a corresponding one of a service center and a designated subscriber. However Easley discloses the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises one of (A) a routing number to route to an operator of a service center that handles authentication failure or authorization denial (Fig. 23 see Routing digits) and (B) information corresponding to a phone number assigned by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal (Fig 23 see CallingPartyNumber). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the above features as taught Easley to the combination of Pilc and Easley, in order to provide the phone number an operator of a service center as well as number dialed by the subscriber. The combination of Pilc and Easley do not disclose then the switching system connects the originated call with a corresponding one of a service center and a designated subscriber. However Hansen discloses then the switching system connects the originated call with a corresponding one of a service

center and a designated subscriber (column 2, 25-36). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the above features as taught Hanson to the combination of Pilc and Easley, in order to connect the call to a service center when authentication has failed due to unpaid bills, or connect the call to the designation when authentication has not failed.

Regarding claim 14, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, and Hanson does not disclose that when a routing number of an Intelligent Peripheral (IP) that provides a prescribed announcement and service has not been assigned in the SCP, the SCP transmits a seize resource message to the IP. However, Easley teaches when a routing number of an Intelligent Peripheral (IP) that provides a prescribed announcement and service has not been assigned in the SCP, the SCP transmits a seize resource message to the IP (column 13, lines 10-17). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught Easley to the combination of Pilc and Hanson, in order to route the call to an announcement even when the routing number has not been assigned in the SCP.

Regarding claim 15, see the rejection of claim 14 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, and Hanson does not disclose that the seize resource message comprises a parameter for the prescribed announcement and service, and wherein the seize resource message causes the SCP to be assigned a

Art Unit: 2681

resource to access the corresponding announcement and the special service from the IP. However Easley teaches the seize resource message comprises a parameter for the prescribed announcement and service, and wherein the seize resource message causes the SCP to be assigned a resource to access the corresponding announcement and the special service from the IP (Figure 17, also column 13 line 35 to column 14 line 24). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught Easley to Pilc and Hanson, in order to use the parameter in seize resource message to play an appropriate announcement.

Regarding claim 17, see the rejection of claim 16 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Easley does not disclose transmitting a voice announcement provided by the switching system and releasing the originated call, when the authorization failure trigger is in a non-activated state. However Hanson teaches transmitting a voice announcement provided by the switching system and releasing the originated call, when the authorization failure trigger is in a non-activated state (column 6, line 24-28). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught Hansen to Pilc and Easley, in order to disconnect fraudulent calls.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777, and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691, and further in

view of Hanson, US Patent 6029062, and even further view of Clapton et al., US Patent 6192237.

Regarding claim 8, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson do not disclose the origination request instruction message comprises an Initial Detection Point message in an ITU or a Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (GSM/UMTS). However, Clapton teaches the origination request instruction message comprises an Initial Detection Point message in a Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (GSM/UMTS) (column 5, lines 2-34). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught by Clapton to the combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hansen, in order to conform to Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications standards.

9. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777, and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691, and further in view of Hanson, US Patent 6029062, and even further view of Gourdin et al., US Patent 5913162.

Regarding claim 10, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson do not disclose the

response message comprises a Connection message to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location in an intelligent network of an ITU or a Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications. However Gourdin teaches the response message comprises a Connection message to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location in an intelligent network of a Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications (column 8, lines 1-18). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught by Gourdin to the combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hansen, in order to conform to Global System for Mobile/Universal Mobile Telecommunications standards.

10. Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777, and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691, and further in view of Hanson, US Patent 6029062, and even further view of D'Amico et al., US Patent 5579379.

Regarding claim 12, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson does not disclose that when the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises information to transmit an announcement with a special purpose, the switching system establishes an originated call with an Intelligent Peripheral assigned in a routing number. However D'Amico discloses when the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises

information to transmit an announcement with a special purpose, the switching system establishes an originated call with an Intelligent Peripheral assigned in a routing number (column 21 lines 57-65). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught D'Amico to the combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson, in order to route the call to an announcement that could prompt for payment options.

Regarding claim 13, see the rejection of claim 6 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson does not disclose that the switching system establishes the originated call with a receiving subscriber when the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises an instruction to perform a normal call. However D'Amico discloses the switching system establishes the originated call with a receiving subscriber when the response message transmitted from the SCP comprises an instruction to perform a normal call (column 21 line 35-42 also column 22 lines 9-42). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above feature as taught D'Amico to the combination of Pilc, Easley, and Hanson, in order to provide normal service if authentication has neither failed due to fraudulent activity, nor due to nonpayment of bills for the services.

Art Unit: 2681

11. Claims 16, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777, and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691.

Regarding claim 16, Pilc discloses a method for processing authentication failed/authorization denied subscribers by intelligent network, comprising: determining whether an authorization failure trigger for a corresponding subscriber is in an activated state (the YES state of block 815 in Fig 5 is equivalent to state of activation), when an authentication failure or an authorization denial is detected for the subscriber who has originated a call (Fig 1. block 813, note performing first level of security processing is equivalent to analyzing authentication and authorization); sending an origination request to a Service Central Point (SCP) that which handles the corresponding trigger (block 827, Fig. 5, also column 9, lines 25-27), when the authorization failure trigger is in an activated state (Yes state of block 815 in Fig 5); Pilc does not disclose analyzing the origination request and transmitting a response message to a switching system to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location according to the result of the analysis; and connecting the originated call to the prescribed location according to the response message. However Easley discloses analyzing the origination request and transmitting a response message to a switching system to connect the call originated by the subscriber to a prescribed location according to the result of the analysis; and connecting the originated call to the prescribed location according to the response message (column 6 line 67 to column 7, line 7). Therefore,

at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Easley to Pilc, in order to provide location information as well as additional options to route the call of an authorization failed/authorization denied subscriber.

Regarding claim 19, see the rejection of claim 16 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc does not disclose the response message comprises one of (A) a routing number to an operator of a service center that handles the authentication failure or authorization denial and (B) information on a phone number designated by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal. However Easley discloses the response message comprises one of (A) a routing number to an operator of a service center that handles the authentication failure or authorization denial (Fig. 23 see Routing digits) and (B) information on a phone number designated by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal (Fig 23 see CallingPartyNumber). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Easley to Pilc, in order to provide appropriate routing number in the response messages.

Regarding claim 20, see the rejection of claim 19 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Pilc does not disclose the response message comprises the routing number to the operator of the service center that handles the authentication failure or authorization denial when the analysis of the origination request indicates that the SCP

is to connect the originated call to the service center, and wherein the response message comprises information on a phone number designated by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal when the SCP is to connect to a phone number designated by the legitimate subscriber of the corresponding terminal. However Easley discloses the response message comprises the routing number to the operator of the service center that handles the authentication failure or authorization denial when the analysis of the origination request indicates that the SCP is to connect the originated call to the service center (Fig. 23 see Routing digits), and wherein the response message comprises information on a phone number designated by a legitimate subscriber of a corresponding terminal when the SCP is to connect to a phone number designated by the legitimate subscriber of the corresponding terminal (Fig 23 see CallingPartyNumber). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Easley to Pilc, in order to provide the phone numbers the subscriber should be connected to depending on the results of analysis the state of the call.

12. Claims 18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pilc et al., US Patent 5510777, and in view of Easley et al., US Patent 6496691, further view of D'Amico et al., US Patent 5579379.

Regarding claim 18, see the rejection of claim 16 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Easley does not disclose a reason for the authentication failure and

the authorization denial included in the origination request, a location information, and a service profile for the subscriber are considered in the analysis of the origination request. However Pilc discloses a reason for the authentication failure and the authorization denial included in the origination request (block 827, Fig. 5, also column 9, lines 25-27). D'Amico discloses a location information, and a service profile for the subscriber are considered in the analysis of the origination request (column 21, lines 32-34). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by Pilc and D'Amico to Easley, in order to decide whether the authentication has failed due to fraud or nonpayment and give nonpaying subscriber an opportunity to make payment.

Regarding claim 21, see the rejection of claim 16 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Easley do not disclose the response message comprises a routing number when the SCP is to transmit a voice announcement having a special purpose, if the routing number to be routed to an Intelligent Peripheral transmitting the voice announcement has been assigned. However D'Amico discloses the response message comprises a routing number when the SCP is to transmit a voice announcement having a special purpose, if the routing number to be routed to an Intelligent Peripheral transmitting the voice announcement has been assigned (column 21 line 57-65). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the

above features as taught by D'Amico to Easley and Pilc, in order to include the routing number in the response message to play the announcement.

Regarding claim 22, see the rejection of claim 21 regarding the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of Pilc and Easley do not disclose the analysis of the origination request determines whether the SCP is to transmit the voice announcement. However D'Amico discloses the analysis of the origination request determines whether the SCP is to transmit the voice announcement (column 21 lines 57-65). Therefore, at the time of the invention it could have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the above features as taught by D'Amico to Easley and Pilc, in order play the announcement depending on the state of call.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Amadon et al., US Patent 5517555, Real Time Information System for Cellular Telephones, where customer account balance is monitored and in the event of detecting excessive charges made by a cellular phone, a connection between the communication system and the cellular telephone switch control port allows commands to be issued directly from the communication system to the cellular telephone switch providing operational control of selected cellular telephones.

Art Unit: 2681

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farima Farkhondar whose telephone number is 703-305-6285. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 703-305-4040. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the customer service whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Farima Farkhondar *22*  
Examiner

September 30, 2003



NGUYEN T. VO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER